

**From:** Wong fei-hung  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 10:26am  
**Subject:** Tunney Act - PFJ - My Two Bits

Hello,

I am writing because I believe the PFJ in the Microsoft Antitrust Case is severely lacking in several areas. The key areas I am concerned with can be found outlined at the following internet url:

< <http://www.kegel.com/remedy/letter.html> >

Please look at these points and reconsider what you feel is the appropriate action. I worked for CompuServe and was there for the merger with AOL. One of the things I didn't understand is how the government would go to AOL/CompuServe for a definition of what an online service is. Somehow AOL/CompuServe convinced the Antitrust Division that they were an "internet service provider" and had plenty of competition. This point was key to getting the approval to merge.

This couldn't have been farther from the truth. AOL/CompuServe are online community providers that also happen to provide access to the internet. There wasn't any comparable service of any size at that time. Now AOL has the market cornered as an Online Community Provider and the CompuServe "brand" is dying a slow quiet death.

The PFJ looks like the Antitrust Office is making the same mistake again by allowing a technical company to use smoke and mirrors to negotiate an outcome that will have little to no long lasting effect on Microsoft and doesn't halt their monopolist practices one iota.

Thank you for your time,

Raymond L. Haines  
Support Analyst  
U.S. Citizen

---

Chat with friends online, try MSN Messenger: <http://messenger.msn.com>